## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

## **NOTICE OF DOCUMENT DISCREPANCIES**

		08 AGG -8 AM 18: The Space for Clerk's Office File Stamp
TO: U. S. DISTRICT JUDGE / U. S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE Houston		
FROM: K. Hammerly, Deputy Clerk RECEIVED DATE: 8/4/2005		
	SE NO.: <u>07cv1836</u>	
CASE TITLE: Powell v. City of Chula Vista, et al		
DOCUMENT ENTITLED: <u>Under Seal Documents</u>		
Upon the submission of the attached document(s), the following discrepancies are noted:		
<u>/</u>	Local Rule	Discrepancy
	5.1	Missing time and date on motion and/or supporting documentation
	5.3	Document illegible or submitted on thermal facsimile paper
	5.4	Document not filed electronically. Notice of Noncompliance already issued.
	7.1 or 47.1	Date noticed for hearing not in compliance with rules/Document(s) are not timely
	7.1 or 47.1	Lacking memorandum of points and authorities in support as a separate document
	7.1 or 47.1	Briefs or memoranda exceed length restrictions
	7.1	Missing table of contents
	15.1	Amended pleading not complete in itself
	30.1	Depositions not accepted absent a court order
		Supplemental documents require court order
		Default Judgment in sum certain includes calculated interest
X		OTHER: Requests to seal documents must be made through an ex parte application or order that is separate from the documents that Plaintiff wishes to seal as per Orders #43 and #5
		<b>Date forwarded:</b> <u>8/5/2008</u>
ORDER OF THE JUDGE / MAGISTRATE JUDGE IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:		
_		be filed nunc pro tunc to date received.
X	The document is N copy of this order of	OT to be filed, but instead REJECTED. and it is ORDERED that the Clerk serve a on all parties.
	Rejected document	to be returned to pro se or inmate?  Yes. Court Copy retained by chambers
	Counsel is advised that any further failure to comply with the Local Rules may lead to penalties pursuant to Local Rule 83.1	
	to mount this odil	CHAMBERS OF: Houston
	Dated: <b>8-7-08</b> cc: All Parties	By: <u>e. Hill</u>